DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 605 HE 015 042

AUTHOR Nettles, Michael T.
TITLE The Development and Validation of Criteria and Method for Evaluating Statewide Planning for Higher Education.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 60p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; College Planning; College Role; Educational Objectives; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Financial Support; *Higher Education; Legislators; *Master Plans; Needs Assessment; Private Colleges; Questionnaires; State Colleges; *Statewide Planning; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Tennessee

ABSTRACT

The task of developing and validating planning criteria for evaluating statewide master planning was studied. Through a review of literature on statewide planning in higher education, statewide planning purposes were identified, and criteria for evaluating statewide planning process, product, and outcomes were established. The criteria were reviewed by a group of 75 legislators, executive branch staff, public higher education lay board and commission members, public and private college officials, and faculty in Tennessee and some out-of-state experts familiar with statewide planning. A questionnaire on planning criteria was constructed and administered to constituents of state plans for their subjective evaluation. Fifty-six persons representing eight constituent groups, including public and private universities and community colleges, participated. There was an overall consensus on the criteria, and there was only one planning purpose (issues identification) on which there was a significant difference of opinion. Some evaluators felt that the planning purpose goes beyond the identification of issues, and that issues identification was only a means to achieve the larger purpose. Public college administrators/presidents and legislators viewed the state coordinating staff as providing primary leadership in most planning processes, while private college officials desired a large role in most planning processes. Views on goal-setting, funding, role and mission statements, and other areas are considered. A bibliography and sample questionnaires are appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216605

The Development and Validation of Criteria and Method for Evaluating Statewide Planning for Higher Education

Dr. Michael T. Nettles

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael T. Nettles

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 015 042

Background
The Origin and Function of State Level Planning for Higher Education

The major development of state-level master plans for higher education has occurred in the United States over the last two decades. Prior to the 1960's, there was very little activity in statewide comprehensive planning for higher education. The action to develop master plans was initiated by state governor and legislators that were concerned about the increase in the demand for college education and the rapid increase in state government funding.

Higher education enrollments grew from approximately two million in 1946 to seven million in 1967 (O'Neil, 1971, p. 8) and up to over eleven million in 1978 (Anderson, 1977). It took over three hundred years from the beginning of Harvard University in 1636 to enroll the first two million students in 1947, but only twenty years (1967) to enroll the next five million. In 1978, just twelve years later, an additional four million had been added (O'Neil, 1971, p. 11).

There has also been a major change in the ratio distribution of students between public and private institutions. In 1947, the public-private ratio was 52:48 (O'Neil, 1971, p. 11). By 1967, the ratio was 70:30 and in 1978 the ratio was 78:22 public over private (Anderson, 1977).

Contributing to the growth in higher education has been the emergence and expansion of the community college. In 1919, community colleges in the United States enrolled 8,100 students. By 1950, the community college enrollment was 244,000 and 1,331,000 students in 1967. In 1978, there were over 4,000,000 community college students of which 96% were enrolled in public institutions (Anderson, 1977).

Another major growth in higher education has been in the amount of state expenditures. The total state appropriations for public colleges and universities in 1947 was about three hundred fifty million dollars (Biennial Survey of Education in the United States 1946-48, 1948). By 1967, the total state appropriations was four billion five hundred million dollars, and in 1978 state appropriations exceeded fifteen billion dollars (SREB, 1978).

Since the end of World War II, higher education has increased its academic program offerings, has expanded its role in public service and research, and many new college campuses have been constructed. These, coupled with the growth in enrollment and state appropriations, have prompted economy and efficiency minded state governors and legislators to establish centralized lay coordinating and governing boards. One of the intended roles for such boards and their professional staffs is to provide expert appraisals of the need for growth and expansion of higher education (Glenny, 1959, p. 22). Before centralization, state institutions lobbied in competition with one another for as much of the state funds as possible. Institutions rivaled for enrollment, expansion of function, and overall growth (Kelly and McNeely, 1933, p. 199).

American higher education consists of a broad range of institutions from two-year community colleges to four-year and graduate colleges; from colleges of music and art to technical vocational schools; and the list goes on.

The diversity that exists in today's college and university systems evolved during the first three hundred years of American higher education. Although the diversity is recognized as being important, the unplanned and uncontrolled method of individual institutional autonomy in policy-making

is no longer acceptable to government officials. "Issues relating to size, governance, programs, facilities, faculty and staff personnel, student clientele, and budgets are less and less matters left to internal institutional resolution" (Wilson, 1968, p. 134). While serving as president of the American Council of Education, Logan Wilson expressed the urgent need to support statewide planning and shared governance. In his words:

> . . . higher education has become too crucial to the general welfare for its developments to be left entirely to local hands. Many urgent problems cannot be adequately dealt with by individual institutions acting unilaterally, and piecemeal approaches do not yield satisfactory patterns. The development of statewide boards may thus be interpreted as a logical response to the functional need for more centralized policy direction (Wilson, 1968, p. 138).

Often, many centralized governing and coordinating boards have been viewed as a government arm only to oversee funding. However, John Millett noted that "government officials have been not only interested in finances for higher education, but equally or more interested in what these sizable appropriations are providing" (Millett, 1967, p. 3). Millett illustrated the typical questions of legislators:

--What are the state goals and objectives in higher education?
--How well is the state meeting these goals?
--What are the major deficiencies in higher education?
--Where is the state government heading in the field of higher education and where should it be going?

Prior to 1945, only fifteen states had governing boards and only two had coordinating boards (Carnegie Commission, 1971). By 1978, every state had either a centralized governing board or a coordinating commission with the statutory responsibility for statewide planning for higher education (State Postsecondary Education Profiles Handbook, 1978). Although some states have both governing and coordinating boards, only one is designated in each state to conduct the long-range planning. Several methods for

planning and coordination exist and it is necessary for each state to establish a method that will best serve its needs.

Three principles have been found which explain the coordination and planning for higher education in recent years. First, planning should promote diversity among colleges and universities and to discourage competition among institutions in the same system. Second, planning should bring about equity in the treatment of the functions of institutions in a higher education system. Third, planning should preserve academic freedom and autonomy as much as possible in the current period of shared governance - higher education is best served by an office that specifically represents it rather than being incorporated into the state budget office or some other agency that does not represent higher education as a special interest.

Without coordination and centralization, the responses to these questions from individual institutions in the past have represented the state plan (Millett, 1967, p. 3). The dissatisfaction of state government officials with the absence of means for formulating and implementing a statewide point of view about public higher education has caused the movement for statewide planning.

The development of centralized coordination and planning is the newest form of governance in American higher education where there have been only a few other forms of governance. Emogene Pliner divides higher education governance into four periods (Pliner, 1966).

1. Complete institutional autonomy lasting from colonial days to the late 19th century;

2. Creation of single statewide governing boards beginning in the late 19th century, reaching a peak in the first two decades of this century, currently undergoing a slight revival;

3. Creation of voluntary coordination from the 1940's and 1950's; and

4. Creation of statewide coordinating boards beginning in the 1950's and still continuing.

Both governing and coordinating boards are currently involved in the task of master planning in the United States. According to the 1978 ECS publication, State Postsecondary Education Profiles Handbook, twenty-three states had coordinating boards with the responsibility for planning, twenty-four states had centralized governing boards responsible for master planning, and in three states planning was the responsibility of the institutional governing board (State Postsecondary Education Profiles Handbook, 1978). The same publication indicated that twenty-six states had completed at least one master plan before 1978, of which fifteen were produced by coordinating boards and ten were the product of a governing board (Table 1). Several states are currently in the process of preparing their first plan.

While some states continue to establish single governing boards, the most pronounced recent trend is toward coordinating lay boards with professional staffs to conduct planning. Tennessee's 85th Congress of 1967 is a good example of state governments across the country, establishing planning and coordinating boards. This Congress created the Tennessee Higher Education Commission with one of its statutory responsibilities:

> To develop a master plan for the future development of public higher education in Tennessee, taking into account the programs and functions of each of the existing institutions, and to make recommendations to the governing boards of the various institutions and to the General Assembly.

Table 1. State responsibilities for long-range plannings[a]

State	Statutory provision for long-range planning	Long range planning is conducted by institutional governing bd.	Long range planning is conducted by state level governing bd.	Planning is conducted by coordinating board	Has developed a master plan by 1978
Alabama	X			X	X
Alaska	X			X	
Arizona	X	X	X		
Arkansas	X			X	X
California	X			X	X
Colorado	X			X	X
Connecticut	X			X	X
Delaware	X			X	
Florida	X		X		
Georgia	X		X		
Hawaii	X		X		
Idaho	X		X		
Illinois	X		X		X
Indiana	X			X	X
Iowa	X		X		
Kansas	X		X		
Kentucky	X			X	X
Louisiana	X		X		X
Maine	X		X		
Maryland	X		X		X
Massachusetts	X			X	
Michigan	X		X		
Minnesota	X			X	X
Mississippi	X	X			
Missouri	X			X	
Montana	X		X		
Nebraska	X			X	
Nevada	X		X		

[a]State Postsecondary Education Profiles Handbook, 1978 Edition.

Table 1 (Continued)

State	Statutory provision for long-range planning	Long range planning is conducted by institutional governing bd.	Long range planning is conducted by state level governing bd.	Planning is conducted by coordinating board	Has developed a master plan by 1978
New Hampshire	X			X	X
New Jersey	X			X	X
New Mexico	X			X	
New York	X		X		X
North Carolina	X		X		X
North Dakota	X		X		
Ohio	X		X		X
Oklahoma	X			X	X
Oregon	X			X	
Pennsylvania	X		X		X
Rhode Island	X				X
South Carolina	X		X		X
South Dakota	X		X		X
Tennessee	X			X	X
Texas	X			X	X
Utah	X		X		X
Vermont					
Virginia	X			X	X
Washington	X			X	X
West Virginia	X		X		
Wisconsin	X		X		
Wyoming	X			X	

Another example with an even more specific charge is the California statute:

> The California Postsecondary Education Commission shall prepare a five-year state plan for postsecondary education which shall consider at least the following factors: (a) the need for and location of new facilities; (b) the range and kinds of programs appropriate to each institution or system; (c) the budgetary priorities of the institutions and systems of postsecondary education; (d) the impact of various types and levels of student charges on students and on postsecondary educational programs and institutions; (e) appropriate levels of state-funded student financial aid; (f) access and admissions of students to postsecondary education; (g) the educational programs and resources of private postsecondary institutions; and (h) the provisions of this division differentiating the functions of the public systems of higher education.

Now that some background has been established, I will focus on the need for evaluting state planning, the development of criteria for evaluating state planning, and finally, the results of an assessment of the criteria by planning constituents.

Status of State-Level Planning Evaluation

By definition and in purpose, a statewide higher education master plan is a guide for the systematic development of academic programs, fiscal patterns, and capital and physical facilities. Master Planning is cyclical in that it is constructed for a specified time period (usually 5 to 10 years) the end of which marks the time to repeat the process in developing a new plan. At some point during the planning cycle, there is a need to evaluate the effectiveness of the planning process, product and impact and a need to examine the focus of the master plan. It appears that most evaluations of statewide higher education plans now occur as a coincidence during the development of a new plan. This means that evaluations are usually confined to the primary planners who decide to do some things differently because of lessons learned from previous planning experience. Such a method gives no assurance of a thorough assessment in which all problems have been considered. Master planning evaluations have been advised by many planning experts and scholars, but few formal attempts have been conducted due to the lack on consensus on the criteria to use in evaluating planning as well as the other functions of coordination. All evaluations of state level planning have been of the professional judgment type wherein experts review the state of planning and then renders peer advice.

Robert Berdahl explained:

> There are no guiding principles for the coordination of higher education, and decisions about coordinating procedures continue to be handled in an ad hoc manner. In absence of objective criteria, each writer must perforce fall back on his own private assessments (Berdahl, 1971, p. 255).

However, the lack of criteria for evaluating master planning prohibits the all important exercise of self-study that is very important to organization development and is germane to the support of peer evaluation.

Attempts to develop criteria for evaluating state board functions have encountered many problems. The most recognizable deterrent has been the inability to gain a consensus on criteria. However, there is continuous effort toward developing such criteria. Berdahl recommended:

> Another approach to the problem of complete subjectivity in evaluations is to turn to the relative safety of "pluralistic subjectivity"--that is, to seek to incorporate a variety of subjective viewpoints, knowing that they will probably not agree (Berdahl, 1971, p. 12).

This viewpoint of Berdahl supports the heart of this current study--the development and validation of planning criteria for evaluating master planning by determining what should be the purposes, processes, product components, and outcomes of planning and who should participate in the planning process.

Study Procedures

The initial stage of this study was a review of literature on statewide planning in higher education, its origin, development, and functions. Through the literature review the purposes for statewide planning were identified and criteria for evaluating statewide planning process, product, and outcomes were established. These criteria are listed in Appendix A.

Then, the criteria were reviewed by a group of 75 legislators, executive branch staff, public higher education lay board and commission members, public college presidents, private college administrators, public college administrators and faculty in the State of Tennessee and some out-of-state experts who are known to be familiar with statewide planning. (An illustration is provided in Figure 1.)

Following the advisory-groups' evaluation of the criteria, a questionnaire was constructed to include the planning criteria divided into four parts: (1) master planning purposes, (2) master planning

processes, (3) master planning product, and (4) master planning outcomes. The questionnaire is designed to be administered to constituents of state plans for their subjective evaluation.

	What are the major purposes of master planning?	What are the planning processes and who should be the participants in each of these processes?	What criteria should be used to evaluate master planning product and outcomes?	
	Purposes	Process	Product (Master Plan Document)	Outcomes
Executive Branch				
Legislators				
Lay Board & Commission Members				
Public College Presidents				
Public College Administrators				
Private College Administrators				
College Faculty				
Higher Education Experts				

Figure 1. Structure for developing evaluation criteria

Subjects

Seventy-five persons were selected to represent eight groups in evaluating the master planning purposes, and the criteria for process, product, and outcomes. The eight groups and the number represented from each are listed in Table 2. Each in-state group was selected because they were considered to be constituents or users of the master plan. The executive and legislative branches of government utilize long-range plans when enacting laws affecting higher education. Higher education lay board and commission members were chosen because of their statutory responsibility for authorizing the plan and because they represent the voice of the public on matters of higher education. College presidents and public higher education administrators were selected because of their involvement in formulating the plan and because the plan ultimately has impact upon policies made by both presidents and administrators. Private college administrators were chosen because of a need to clarify and define their role in major public higher education activities, such as long-range planning. Faculty were also chosen because of the need to define their role in master planning, and also because they too are affected by recommendations in the plan. Finally, a group of out-of-state advisors was chosen in order to provide some professional objectivity and to compare with in-state (Tennessee) evaluators. Although students can be viewed as constituents of master planning, they were excluded from this study because of the rapid turnover in student populations.

Each person chosen in each of the eight groups was selected on a nonrandomized basis in which his or her participation in higher education activities at the state-level served as the principle criterion for their selection. All participants were recommended by high ranking officials at the Tennessee Higher Education Commission and the two

Table 2. Selected advisory groups involved in the evaluation of planning criteria

Group	Number of Persons
College presidents	10
Executive branch (Governors office)	2
Faculty	13
Lay board and Commission members	8
Legislature	10
Out-of-state professionals	9
Private higher education administrators	8
Public higher education administrators	15

Governing boards in Tennessee. The executive branch representatives were the governor's only two staff advisors on matters pertaining to higher education. The legislators selected were those on the higher education sub-committee and other members of the legislature who were known to be aware of and most interested in current issues in higher education. The lay board members were those who hold leadership positions on their respective boards and those who had served on the boards the longest having the most experience in master planning. The college presidents and public higher education administrators and faculty were chosen because of their knowledge and/or involvement in state-level planning or related activities. The out-of-state advisors were chosen because of their involvement in advising states on the subject of master planning or because of their writing and publishing on state coordination and planning in higher education.

Special attention was given to obtaining a demographically diverse group of evaluators in terms of race, sex, geographical location of residence, and in the case of higher education administrators and faculty, difference in type of institution (i.e., community college, university, graduate and professional schools). As a result, 15 of the evaluators were women and 15 were black. Of the in-state evaluators 45% live in middle Tennessee, 28% in East Tennessee, and 28% in West Tennessee. The out-of-state evaluators were from different parts of the country--three from the Eastern United States, one from the South, three from the Midwest, one from the Southwest, and one from the West.

Of the public higher education presidents and administrators, eleven were from universities, seven from community colleges, seven from governing and coordinating board staffs, and one each from a post-secondary technical institute and a medical school. There were also eight evaluators who were private college or university administrators.

The faculty included eight persons from public universities, three from public community colleges, and two from private universities. The administrators were selected from among chief academic and fiscal officers. The faculty evaluators also represented several different academic disciplines including education, sociology, engineering, English, chemistry, mathematics, and political science.

Task

All subjects were provided with identical questionnaires and asked to rate the master planning purposes, products, and outcomes. Each subject rated the criteria on the following five-point scale of importance: (1) no importance, (2) of little importance, (3) of average importance, (4) very important, and (5) undecided. Then, the evaluators were asked to rank the ten purposes, the fourteen products, and the thirteen outcomes in

order of importance with 1 being most important and the highest number in each category representing least important.

For the master planning process, the evaluators were asked to indicate the degree of involvement nine constituent groups should have in each of the seven planning processes. The evaluators were asked to indicate whether each group should have no participation, limited participation, continuous advisory participation, or primary leadership in each of the seven processes. A choice of undecided was also available.

All subjects were treated equally by receiving questionnaires through the mail and given 15 days to return the completed questionnaire in a self-addressed prepaid postage envelope.

Analysis

The point of the evaluation was to determine if there can be agreement on a broad set of criteria by all groups involved or affected by the plan. The major hypothesis is as follows:

> Ho. There is no significant difference among the eight criteria evaluation groups ratings of criteria for evaluating master planning purposes, processes, product, and outcomes.

The hypothesis has been tested statistically using one-way analysis of variances (ANOVA) for each planning purpose, process, product, and outcome for each group involved in the evaluation. This amounted to a total of 100 one-way ANOVAS -- 10 for the rating scale analysis of 10 purposes; 63 for the rating scale analysis for all 9 parts of each of the 7 processes; 14 for the rating scale analysis of 14 products; and 13 ANOVAS for the rating scales of 13 outcomes. Kendall's (W) coefficients of Concordance were also used to indicate the average group rankings on purposes, product, and outcomes and to test if the advisors' rankings of purposes, products, and outcomes were the same among the groups. Three multiple range tests were also conducted for paired

comparisons on all the criteria. These tests were Scheffe, Duncan, and Fisher's LSD (least significant difference). However, Duncan was the only one relied upon in the analysis of this data, because Scheffe indicated no differences on any of the criteria, and Fisher's LSD found large numbers of differences. Duncan is more a liberal test than Scheffe but more conservative than Fisher's test.

All statistical tests were computed by computer using SPSS.

Response Rate

There were seventy-five evaluators selected and who received questionnaires. Of those seventy-five, fifty-six (75%) responded and are included in the data anlaysis. Table 3 indicates the number of respondents from each of the eight groups in the evaluation. All fifty-six respondents

Table 3. Number of respondents from the eight criteria advisory groups

Group	Number in sample	Number of respondents
College presidents	10	8
Executive branch	2	2
Faculty	13	11
Lay board	8	3
Legislators	10	5
Out-of-state professionals	9	9
Private college administrators	8	5
Public college administrators	15	13
TOTAL	75	56

completed the rating scales of all four parts of the questionnaire--purposes, processes, products, and outcomes. However, eleven of the responding advisors did not rank-order the purposes, products, and outcomes. Among those nonresponding, one out-of-state advisor stated that "the criteria are all important and to rank them would be equivalent to ranking the importance of the carburetor, wheels and brakes to a car". In the same spirit, a faculty advisor commented that "asking one to rank the criteria, is a bit like asking which is more important to sustain human life: food or water?" Some others who did not rank the criteria stated it was not possible to do and did not give any other explanation. The forty-five advisors who ranked the criteria represent 79% of the responding advisors.

Summary of Findings

In regard to the hypothesis that no differences exist among the eight groups' evaluations of the criteria, it must be concluded that there was an overall consensus on the criteria; therefore, the hypotheses that there is a consensus on the criteria should not be rejected. Out of the 100 ratings tested by analysis of variance, significant differences were found in only 13 (13%). Also, Kendall's W coefficient of concordance indicates that there was a high degree of similarity in the eight groups' rankings of the criteria.

Of the planning purposes, there was a statistically significant difference found relative to only one criterion--issues identification. Some advisors rightfully expressed the opinion that the planning purpose goes beyond the identification of issues, and that issues identification was only a means to achieving the larger purpose.

Much of the differences in the rating of the participants in the planning processes had to do with private college administrators. Private college administrators were desirous of a large role in all the planning processes with the exception of prioritizing and authorization, whereas such advisory groups as public college administrators, public college presidents, and legislators viewed them as having a limited role in the planning processes. There was broad agreement on the state coordinating staff providing the primary leadership in most of the planning processes.

Like the planning purposes, the planning products produced very

little disagreement among the advisors. Only one product, funding priorities, had a significant F value. However, funding priorities was rated as the most important planning product and no advisor rated it anything other than very important or of average importance. It was also clear in the evaluation that the advisors considered the content oriented products such as funding priorities, goal setting, and institutional role and mission as being more important than the stylistic and structural features, such as external and internal appearance or orderly structure. One important product component, about which the advisors were particularly expressive, was that the plan have the appearance of being adaptable to change.

On the planning outcomes, the differences among the advisors were also minimal. One of the statistically significant differences concerned the question of whether planning causes public colleges to unite and become more systematized. The paired comparisons on this criterion, however, indicated that no differences existed on the rating scale responses, and that, overall, this outcome was considered to be important. Another related outcome which produced some differences in responses was that planning causes the public and professionals to view higher education as a system rather than as individual isolated institutions. It is very interesting that all the lay board members viewed this outcome as very important while public college administrators and the out-of-state consultants saw this as having less importance among the outcomes.

It could be that many state-level lay board members view their role as too systematized. It is also understandable that public college administrators may favor having a unique and clearly distinguishable institution.

Overall, the planning outcomes, like the other criteria, was viewed as very important by the advisors. Ther advisors' general overall support of the criteria further proves the earlier assertion that there can be a consensus reached on a well-defined comprehensive set of criteria for evaluation of state level long-range planning. The final chapter will discuss the application of the criteria in a formal evaluation of state level plans and provide an instrument for evaluation.

DISCUSSION

The two goals of this study were accomplished. First, the identification of criteria for state level planning by reviewing the literature; and second, the validation of the criteria by an advisory group of planning constituents. This final discussion has four purposes: (1) to analyze the challenges for planners regarding the most important criteria verified by the advisory group (goal setting, funding priorities, and institutional mission and scope); (2) to discuss the use of the evaluation of the planning process; (3) to re-emphasize the importance of criteria evaluation; and (4) to recommend a method and instrument for evaluating existing state level plans.

As stated in the previous chapter, the advisors considered all the criteria to be important enough to warrant the attention of planners during their preparation and evaluation of master planning. However, goal setting, funding, and institutional role and mission statements were the criteria that were most important to the advisors, in addition to being the criteria that received the most comments from the advisors in the evaluation. These were also the criteria which were mentioned most repeatedly in the literature. Each of these three criteria provide some special challenges to planners, therefore, each will now be discussed and their unique challenges explored.

Goal Setting

It was noted earlier that past peer evaluations found that a major fault of state level planners for higher education was in setting goals which were challenging and ambitious. This failure has been attributed in part to the tendency of state planners to negotiate goals with all the state institutions which have different interests. The end results are statements of compromise. There is a need for planners to exert leadership and objectivity in goal setting in order to best serve the public. Goal setting in state level plans has often been no more than a broad statement of policy, whereas institutional master plans more appropriately have been used to set goals which were operational statements on which the institution proposed to take action. State planners have tended to spend too much time on safe noncontroversial topics such as projecting enrollments, and anticipating labor market supply and demand. State planners have often avoided setting goals on admission standards and other important issues; instead they make statements about the need to do so and delegate the responsibility to the institutions who may or may not carry them out. State plans would be much better if they contained goals about educational quality such as defining the role of faculty members or specifying curriculum requirements. However, the reluctance of state planners to set goals may be in order to avoid conflicts with institutions and other constituents of the plan. Therefore, too often abstract and bland statements serve as the planning goals which are, to a large extent, written for public

consumption, and not for direct action. This is an indication that state planners need to exert leadership in establishing goals for the higher education system. This was also reflected by the criteria advisors who rated coordinating staff as primary leaders in the goal setting process.

Goal setting provides the biggest challenge for state level planners, and the criteria advisors in this evaluation confirm this by rating it the most important purpose, product, and outcome. The advisors were also in agreement in recognizing that educational goals were more important than any other type goals but that some attention also has to be given to economic goal setting. The problems which planners are most likely to confront when taking a more aggressive approach to setting goals, will be in obtaining the cooperation of higher education officials and elected public officials in implementing the objectives necessary to reach the goals. It was found in the literature that higher education institutional leaders will continue to contest any perceived threat to autonomy, especially if they perceive themselves as losers in the planning recommendations; public officials will contest planning goals which they view as having negative impact on their home institutions even if it is clear that the planning goals are beneficial for the overall state system; and some public citizens will contest departures from tradition while others will contest the failure to change. Despite these obstacles, state level planners will be forced by their constituents to make difficult decisions in the interest of being effective and providing the needed functions of planning. At the

same time some organized method has to be employed by state planners so that participants can be included and still come up with meaningful non-negotiated goals.

There is still a need for further study on the subject of goal setting. A different approach may be necessary for each state because of its unique history and its unique organizational patterns for postsecondary education. The following six recommendations are based on this study and other pertinent reports and appear to be essential considerations for planners involved in goal setting:

1. Goals should be based upon sound information about the past. State level planners are responsible for knowing the history of higher education in their state and of past trends concerning enrollment, personnel, funding, curricula, research and public service.

2. Goals should be future oriented with a focus on building upon current strengths and eliminating weaknesses. Planners must distinguish the difference between policy statements and goals. For example, many states that have open admissions policies also have state plans which list the maintenance of free access and open admission as a planning goal when it is actually a policy statement. A goal on the same subject would recognize that there is an open admissions policy but would go further by illustrating how standards should be raised as well as the qualifications of student applicants.

3. Goals should represent a set of value commitments on the part of the planning authority. Planners must have the courage to confront the planning issues head-on with the objectives of making rational decisions concerning the future direction of the higher education system. This most often means that planners have to make decisions on issues about which there are contrasting views, but yielding to extreme compromises may result in mediocrity.

4. Goals should be accompained by a sequential plan for implementation and channel for receiving continuous constructive feedback and evaluation during implementation. In addition to envisioning a goal, planners must demonstrate some leadership

by illustrating alternatives and suggestions for how to get there from here. This also allows planners to know if they are within the limits of their planning authority.

5. Goals should be challenging but tangible. Planners should be imaginative, but must be careful not to set goals for which there are no resources available for implementation.

6. Goals should be set by the planning authority providing leadership with all other participants serving as advisors. Planners have the difficult task of determining how to involve broad participation in the planning process and especially in goal setting. However, what must be avoided is the negotiation of goals.

Funding

Another criterion of special interest to the criteria advisors as evidenced by a large number of comments was funding priorities. Several advisors commented that plans should illustrate clearly the programs and operations to be of high priority for receiving funds during the length of the plan. It was pointed out in Chapter II, that in addition to planning and academic program review, funding is another major function of state coordinating and governing boards. The major role of these boards is to find equitable means for allocating funds to higher education institutions. Therefore, the desire of the planning constituents to have funding plans is justified. However, planners face some difficult challenges in this regard as well.

First of all, most states utilize formulas for annual allocations of operating funds. Therefore, any projections of future funding levels will be based upon other variables such as enrollment and credit hours produced. To indicate accurately the operating funds to be appropriated will depend upon how accurate the projections of other associated variables

are. A second difficulty is that in any state, funding for higher education or any other government function, has the involvement of elected officials in the legislative and executive branch. Commitments for funding can only rightfully be made by these officials. And, still another difficulty is that funding to higher education in any given year will depend to a large degree on how well the state is doing fiscally. It has been difficult over the past few years to measure this from year to year.

Those matters for which planners do not have control, however, should not prohibit planners from fulfilling the planning requirement of establishing priorities for needed programs, capital outlay needs, and research. In fact, successful planners can affect political decisions by providing more complete and persuasive information and data on future needs. State planners also have the opportunity to build credibility with public elected officials who will have direct impact on decision-making.

The criteria evaluator's interest may be interpreted as a request for strong representation by planners of the funding needs of higher eudcation and active defense of higher education and its fiscal needs. In this sense, state planners are seen as protectors and promoters of higher education institutions in the budgetary process.

Role and Mission

Role and mission statements were other major criteria for state level planning that the advisors considered very important. The criteria advisors showed interest in the related outcome of differentiating functions of higher education institutions by role and mission statements. It was confirmed by the criteria advisors, that this is an essential requirement of state plans. The most compelling arguments for role and mission statements are that they are the means by which institutions can identify areas of common interest so that they can share resources and coordinate into an integrated system. It is important for plans to clearly differentiate functions among types of institutions.

Role and mission statements, however, may also present some problems for planners. Among them are the following: (1) role and misison statements too often appear to show aspirations of every state institution to become like the large state comprehensive university; (2) role and mission statements may be contrary to the institution's faculty, staff, and administrators' views which can cause some frustration to the institution; (3) because state-supported institutions are part of a system, the incentive and rewards are often systematic and do not often enough encourage uniqueness and difference; and (4) the spirit among institutions is often one of competition rather than coordination and cooperation.

It is the role of the state-level planner to illustrate and complement the different functions of each college and university with regard to its program offerings, environmental setting, instruction, public service and

research. There must also be incentives provided which encourage institutions to emphasize their unique strengths. There is some question as to what the contents of role and scope statement should be, how they should be organized, and whether it should be the role of state planners to develop these statements, or should it be the responsibility of institutional officials. These questions will have to continue to be studied by state planners.

The challenges associated with the above three criteria are by no means the only ones. However, they do represent the challenges which are deserving of priority attention of state planners who desire to improve the effectiveness of planning.

Planning Process

Another major part of the evaluation was to identify the role and amount of participation the planning constituent groups should have in the planning process. The planning process was clearly defined in the literature and the experts in long-range planning were in agreement about the necessary steps to be taken in developing a plan. Many were also in agreement that the process was as important if not more important than any other aspect of planning. What was not apparent in the literature was who should participate in the planning process and the role the participants should play. The Literature Review illustrated how many of the authors made general statements which in essence said that there should be broad participation in order to get support of the plan to assure its

implementation. It was also illustrated earlier in this chapter how improper use of participants can be detrimental to master planning resulting in watered-down planning recommendations.

The problem of participation is compounded when considering the fact that newly created state coordination and governing boards are responsible for planning for more long-standing traditional institutions which have often been opposed to centralized planning and other governing authorities. Therefore, because there was more uncertainty about the participants in the process rather than the process itself, it was more useful to determine how the constituents should get involved in the process. The analysis of the advisors' ratings as in the other parts of the evaluation indicated that in most cases there were no significant differences among the advisory groups' ratings of the participants. There were, however, some differences among the advisors' ratings of private college administrators as participants in the planning process. In general, it was found that private college officials desired an active continuous role in the process, while all other groups of advisors viewed them as having little or no participation in state-level planning. This will vary from state to state and will depend largely upon how much public financial support is provided to the private institutions. There may be some reluctance to include private college administrators in public activities for which they have no legal responsibility nor commitment to implement.

The most interesting result of this evaluation was that it provided a clear distinction of who the leaders are in each stage of the planning

process. The state coordinating staff was viewed as the primary leader in the early developmental stages of the plan; lay board and commission members as the leaders in authorizing the plan; and college faculty and administrators as the leaders in implementing the plan. The process evaluation also indicated that many perceptions of lay board and commission members as participants in public approval and not process are not broadly supported. Lay board and commission members were seen as active participants throughout the planning process. Finally, the advisors indicated a minor role for out-of-state consultants in the planning process. This indicates that a caution should be given to state planners about the over reliance upon outsiders who have no allegiance to seeing that the plan is implemented.

The method used in the process evaluation can be very useful to state planners in determining how best to apply their human resources in developing a master plan. Not only does it indicate how much participation there should be in the planning process, it also shows at what stages the constituents can be most helpful. This is consistent with the importance attached to criteria evaluation throughout this study, and will be briefly re-examined.

Criteria Evaluation

The need for developing criteria for evaluating state planning is supported by the fact that the only current means for planners to assess the success of their plans is through peer review or by comparison of ones

own state plan with those of other states. It has been illustrated earlier that the first method has limited advantages and is not often utilized, and the latter method may suffice for structural and stylistic evaluation, but each state's historical developmental uniquenesses prohibit the comparison of substance. Thus, the development of criteria is a necessary first step.

While it has been recommended in this study to apply the theory of pluralism in determining the criteria for planning and evaluation, other options do exist. One option is simply to utilize the legislative statutes and allow eventual legislative judgment to serve as the criteria. This approach for the planning agency has the advantage of fulfilling the immediate requirement of being responsive to the government branch that created it. It also means that the principal purpose of planning would be to advise lawmakers in their decision-making, using the master plan as the guiding light. The liabilities of this approach far outweigh the benefits. First of all, because of the turnover in state legislatures due to retirements, resignations, and elections, the primary legislative developers of the criteria and supporters of the planning agency are not to be in office permanently. Therefore, the criteria may be temporarily effective for as long as its developers are in office. Second, this approach runs the risk of isolating and alienating other planning constituents, namely, the executive branch, and college and university officials. And third, legislative statutes are most often for the purpose of establishing a principal expectation and providing the necessary machinery to fulfill that expectation. It does not, nor should

it, dictate the methods and professional standards for carrying out the mission.

Another approach to establishing criteria is for higher education officials to collectively develop it themselves. This approach has the benefit of allowing the experts to determine what the plan should contain. It also has the benefit of having the appearance of protecting institutional authority and autonomy. The major liability of this approach is that it closely resembles voluntary coordinating activities of the 20th century. The literature has revealed that voluntary attempts at coordination failed due to the competitiveness of higher education institutions during the early and middle decades of this century.

The method of establishing criteria prescribed in this study appears to contain the benefits of the other approaches minus the liabilities. The use of all the constituent groups in the criteria evaluation allows the planner to identify any unique needs to any group and also to determine the similarities in their planning needs. It avoids alienating any group while serving all. This form of criteria evaluation also serves to identify changing requirements of planning as well. For example, the impetus of planning was the rapid expansion of higher education for which planned growth was essential. Today, the issues are no longer expansion, but retrenchment. The changed condition does not eliminate the need for planning but does alter its emphasis. Instead of planning public access, the new emphasis may be on providing better quality, and planners must align themselves with the planning needs.

Three major concluding recommendations for criteria development are:

1. Criteria for evaluation should consist of the following: an examination of the specific planning purposes; a determination of the parts of the planning process and the participants in each process; an examination of the product components of the plan; and an examination of the desired outcomes of the plan.

2. Any development of criteria for planning and evaluation should view input from the planning constituency as essential.

3. Criteria evaluation should be cyclical so as to identify changes in the emphasis of planning criteria.

Evaluating State Level Plans

The major reason for developing and validating the criteria in this study was for application in an actual evaluation of state higher education planning in Tennessee. An evaluation instrument which contains the criteria is illustrated in Appendix B. The evaluation of master planning focuses upon the purposes, process, product, and outcomes of long-range state level planning for higher education.

Evaluations of state level plans should be formative and summative. The evaluation should be concerned with the performance outcomes of the previous plan, but also with helping the developer of the future plan to make improvements. The primary goals of master planning evaluation are first, to determine the strengths and limitations of the plan; second, to distinguish between the planning goals that have been accomplished from those that have not; and third, to get feedback about

the past plan in order to improve future plans. In terms of the criteria validated in this study by the advisors and applied to the evaluation questionnaire in Appendix B, the goals of the evaluation are:

1. To determine the extent to which the master planning purposes have been served.
2. To determine the strengths and limitations of the contents of the planning document.
3. To determine if the planning goals have been accomplished and what other outcomes have been attained.
4. To determine if constituency groups were given adequate participation in the planning process.

Master planning evaluations should apply the principal of pluralism similar to that used in validating the criteria in this study. Much is to be learned by planners through an open form of evaluation, and it allows the constituents of the plan to be formally involved in the process.

The primary impetus for this study was to provide a method for formal evaluation in order to remove some uncertainty of state planners concerning the function of state planning in higher education. The findings of this study indicate that the planning constituency is not in great disagreement about its expectations of state level plans. Continuous evaluation of planning is essential to continue to respond to public need; to respond to changing conditions; and above all to improve the overall function of master planning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrahams, Louise. Present Planning for Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1967.

Abrahams, Louise. State Planning for Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1969.

Alabama's Challenge: Higher Education for the 1980's. A Report of the second committee to evaluate the effectiveness of the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, Montgomery, Ala., March 1979.

Albright, A. D. "Statewide Perspective on Planning with Faculty." In More for Less - Academic Planning with Faculty without New Dollars, edited by James Nesmith. New York: Society for College and University Planning, 1975.

Anderson, Charles, ed. A Fact Book. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1977.

Anderson, Scarvia B., Samuel Ball, and Richard T. Murphy. Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Balderston, Frederick E. "Statewide Planning and the Individual Institutions Response." In Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education: Issues and Design, edited by Lyman A. Glenny and George B. Weathersby. Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1971.

Beeby, C. E. Planning and the Educational Administrator. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning, 1967.

Bender, Louis W. "Planning After the Golden Decade." In Improving Statewide Planning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1974.

Berdahl, Robert O. Statewide Coordination of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Berdahl, Robert O., ed. Evaluating Statewide Boards. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1975.

Biennial Survey of Education in the United States 1946-48. Washington, D.C.: Federal Security Agency Office of Education, 1948.

Bolin, John G. Institutional Long-Range Planning. Athens, Georgia: Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, 1969.

Boyer, Ernest. "Encouraging Innovation Through Long-Range Planning." In Planning for State Systems of Postsecondary Education, edited by Fred Hurcleroad. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1973.

Briscoe, Keith G. "Dear New Trustee." Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges 21, No. 6 (November/December 1979): 23.

Brown, David. "The Supreme Role of Faculty in Planning - Why and How?" In More for Less, Academic Planning with Faculty without New Dollars, edited by James M. Nesmith. New York: Society for College and University Planning, 1975.

Browne, Arthur D. "The Institution and the System: Autonomy and Coordination." In Long-Range Planning in Higher Education, edited by Owen A. Knorr. Boulder, Colorado: WICHE, 1965.

Brumbaugh, A. J. Statewide Planning and Coordination of Higher Education. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963.

California Education Code, Sec. 22712, 1961.

Callan, Patrick M. "Evaluating Planning by Statewide Boards." In Evaluating Statewide Boards, edited by Robert O. Berdahl. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1975.

Cantlon, John E. "The Threat of Efficiency: Perspective of the Large University." In More for Less - Academic Planning with Faculty without New Dollars, edited by James Nesmith. New York: Society for College and University Planning, 1975.

Carnegie Council on Higher Education. The Capitol and the Campus State Responsibility for Postsecondary Education. Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1971.

Chambers, M. M. The Campus and the People. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers & Publishers Inc., 1960.

Cheit, Earl B. "Planning for Quality." In More for Less - Academic Planning with Faculty without New Dollars, edited by James Nesmith. New York: Society for College and University Planning, 1975.

Churchman, Charles W. The Systems Approach. New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

Colm, Gerhard. Integrated of National Planning and Budgeting. Washington, D.C.: National Planning Association, 1968.

Conference on Postsecondary Statewide Planning for 1980-1985. (Proceedings). Alabama Commission on Higher Education, Montgomery, Alabama, 1978.

Coordination or Chaos? Report of the Task Force on Coordination, Governance and Structure of Postsecondary Education. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1973.

Dunlap, E. T. "Development and Implementation of a State Higher Education Plan." In Planning for State Systems of Postsecondary Education, edited by Fred Harcleroad. Iowa City: American College Testing Service, 1972.

Dykes, Archie R. Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Eurich, Alvin C. and Sidney G. Ticton. Long-Range Planning and Budgeting at Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1975.

Fact Book on Higher Education in the South 1977 and 1978. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1978.

Federal Register. Public Law 92-318, Section 196, 86 Stat., June 23, 1972.

Fincher, Cameron. Planning in Higher Education. (Monograph). Athens, Georgia: Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, 1966.

Folger, John K. "SSTRR" (Seek Systems that Reward Results). In Planning and Management Practices in Higher Education: Promise or Dilemma?, edited by Richard Millard et al. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1972.

Ford, Paul Leicester, ed. The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. IX. New York: G. P. Putnams Sons, 1898.

Gardner, Don E. "Five Evaluation Frameworks: Implications for Decision Making in Higher Education." The Journal of Higher Education 48, No. 5. (September/October, 1977):571.

Glenny, Lyman. Autonomy of Public Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Glenny, Lyman, Robert Berdahl, Ernest Palola, and James Paltridge. Coordinating Higher Education for the 70's. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971.

Glenny, Lyman, and George Weathersby, ed. Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education: Issues and Design. Boulder: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1971.

Glenny, Lyman. "What are We in For?" In Planning and Management Practices in Higher Education: Promise or Dilemma?, edited by Richard Millard et al. Denver: Education Commission of the Statest, 1972.

Glenny, Lyman, and Julie Hurst. "Current Statewide Planning Structures and Powers." In Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education: Issues and Design, edited by Lyman Glenny and George Weathersby. Boulder: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, The American Council on Education, and Education Commission of the States, 1971.

Glenny, Lyman, and Thomas Dalglish. Public Universities, State Agencies, and the Law: Constitutional Autonomy in Decline. Berkeley: University of California, 1973.

Gomberg, Irene L., and Frank J. Atelsek. "Who's on the Governing Board?" Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges 19, No. 6 (November/December, 1977): p. 16.

Halstead, Kent. Statewide Planning in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1974.

Harcleroad, Fred F. "Planning: A Basic Responsibility for a State System." In Planning for State Systems of Postsecondary Education. Iowa City: The American College Testing Service, 1973.

Higher Education in Tennessee, A Statewide Master Plan, 1979.

Johnson, Elizabeth H. "Why Statewide Boards". Association of Governing Boards 18, No. 2 (March/April, 1976):11.

Keller, John E. "Planning and Resource Allocation." In Planning and Management Practices in Higher Education. Promises and Dilemma?, edited by Richard Millard et al. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1972.

Kelly, F. J., and J. H. McNeely. The State and Higher Education. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1933.

Klasson, Charles R. "The Economic Base for Statewide Systems Planning: The Nature of the Problem." In Planning for State Systems of Postsecondary Education, edited by Fred Harcleroad. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1973.

Kneverich, Stephen J. Administrative Technology and the School Executive. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1969.

Knorr, Owen A. Long-Range Planning in Higher Education. (Proceedings of the Annual Institute on College Self-Study of College and University Administrators). Boulder: WICHE, July 1964.

Koontz, Harold and Cyril O'Donnell. Principles of Management, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968, p. 81.

Kratz, Robert Norman. Educational Planning Literature Review. Monticello, Illinois: Council of Planning Librarians, 1971.

LeBreton, Preston P. and Dale A. Henning. Planning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1961.

Lyman, Richard W. "A Toast to Trustees." Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges 21, No. 5 (September/October, 1979).

McGrath, Earl J. General Education and the Plight of Modern Man. Indianapolis: The Lilly Endowment Inc., 1976.

McGuiness, Aimes, Harry McKinney, and Richard Millard. The Changing Map of Postsecondary Education. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1975.

McManis, Gerald L., and James L. Harvey. Planning Management and Evaluation Systems in Higher Education. Littleton, Colorado: Ireland Educational Corporation, 1978.

Maher, Thomas H. "Academic Planning and Faculty Involvement: The Invisible College Perspective." In More for Less - Academic Planning with Faculty without New Dollars, edited by James N. Nesmith. Washington, D.C.: Society for College and University Planning, 1975.

Mayhew, Lewis. Long-Range Planning for Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1969.

Millett, John ed. "Statewide Planning and Coordination of Higher Education." (Presentation). Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1967.

Millett, John, ed. Planning in Higher Education: A Manual for Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1976.

Millett, John. Higher Education Planning: A Report of Experience and a Forecast of Strategies for Change. New York: Academy for Educational Development, 1978.

Millett, John. "The States Face Issues of Quality in Higher Education." A Presentation to the Invitational Seminar for Members of Statewide Coordinating and Governing Boards, July 31, 1979. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, 1979. (a)

Millett, John. Challenges in Statewide Planning for the 1980's. (Occasional Paper Number Nine). New York: Academy for Education Development, 1979(b).

Nesmith, James N., ed. More for Less - Academic Planning with Faculty without New Dollars. New York: Society for College and University Planning, 1975.

North Carolina Government Statute, Section 116, 1971.

Odegaard, Charles E. "Statewide Coordination: A Personal Comment." In Evaluating Statewide Boards, edited by Robert Berdahl. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1975.

Ohio Board of Regents. Management Improvement Program. Columbus: Ohio Board of Regents, 1974.

O'Neil, June. Resource Use in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971.

Palola, Ernest, Timothy Lehmann, and William Blischke. Education by Design: The Sociology of Planning. Berkeley: University of California, 1970.

Paltridge, James G. Boards of Trustees: Their Decision Patterns. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1973.

Pliner, Emogene. Coordination and Planning. Baton Rouge: Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, 1966.

Public Acts of Tennessee. Senate Committee Resolution 189, 85th Congress, 1967.

Scott, Brian W. Long-range Planning in American Industry, New York: American Management Association, 1965.

State Postsecondary Education Profiles Handbook. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1978.

Statewide Comprehensive Planning for Postsecondary Education. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1973.

Stufflebeam, Daniel T. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, 1971.

Tennessee Code Annotated 49-4203. Section 1, 1967.

The Capital and the Campus: State Responsibility for Postsecondary Education. Carnegie Council on Higher Education. Hightstown: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

The State of South Carolina General Assembly Legislative Audit Council Management and Operational Review of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. Columbus: June 14, 1978.

Theodore, James L. Crisis in Planning. Columbus: Council of Educational Facility Planners, 1968.

Weathersby, George B. "Tools and Techniques for Planning and Resource Allocation." In Planning and Management Practices in Higher Education: Promise or Dilemma?", edited by Richard Millard et al. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1972.

Wilson, Logan. "Institutional Autonomy and Heteronomy." In Whose Goals for American Higher Education, edited by Charles G. Dobbins and Calvin T. T. Lee. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Wing, Paul. Statewide Planning for Postsecondary Education: Conceptualization and Analysis of Relevant Information. Boulder: WICHE, 1972.

Worthen, Blaine R. and James R. Sanders. Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1973.

Wrapp, Edward H. "Organization for Long-Range Planning." In Long-Range Planning for Management, edited by D. W. Ewing. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1964.

APPENDIX A

POSES FOR STATE-LEVEL POSTSECONDARY MASTER PLANNING

The following is a list of general purposes or reasons for state-level master planning for postsecondary education. Please indicate the relative importance of each purpose in the following ways:

1. Circle the number on the scale to the right of each purpose statement which indicates the importance you believe the purpose has in state-level master planning. (1) No Importance (2) Of Little Importance (3) Of Average Importance (4) Very Important (5) Undecided.

2. Using the space provided below each statement, rank order the purposes from 1-10 with 1 being the most important purpose and 10 being the least important for state-level master planning.

3. Add additional purposes for state-level master planning which are not included in the ten statements.

aster Planning Purposes	No Importance	Of Little Importance	Of Average Importance	Very Important	Undecided
. Goal Setting. To establish an agenda for action by setting goals and objectives for higher education and a clear pattern for pursuing those goals and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
____					
. Issues Identification. To prepare higher education institutions to respond to the social and technological needs of the future by identifying issues.	1	2	3	4	5
____					
0. Responsiveness. To develop strategies for adjusting to enrollment growth and declines as well as economic growth and decline.	1	2	3	4	5
____					
4. Coordination. To establish principles of equity in funding and program distribution by providing a clear understanding of different roles for higher education institutions.	1	2	3	4	5
____					
5. Effectiveness. To develop a system of colleges and universities with emphasis on providing high quality higher education.	1	2	3	4	5
____					

	No Importance	Of Little Importance	Of Average Importance	Very Important	Undecided
ffficiency. To organize public resources so that they an be used in the most cost efficient manner.	1	2	3	4	5
rend Analysis. To record and examine social, conomic, political and educational trends and ccomplishments and to raise the public onsciousness of their future effect on higher ducation.	1	2	3	4	5
ccessibility. To insure that higher education rograms and services are accessible and vailabile to citizens who desire to participate.	1	2	3	4	5
Accountability. To provide for increased accountability of higher education to government officials and the general public.	1	2	3	4	5
Minimize Competition. To eliminate unproductive tensions and conflicts among institutions by creating a spirit of sharing and cooperation.	1	2	3	4	5

tional Purposes: _____

CESSES OF STATE-LEVEL POSTSECONDARY MASTER PLANNING

The state-level master planning processes are the steps or procedures taken by planners to develop a planning document. The following is a list of 7 major processes of postsecondary master planning and various groups of persons who may be participants in each process. Please indicate the degree of involvement you think each group should have in each of the 7 processes by placing an x in one box beside each group for each process. (Each grid should have 9 x's for completion).

1. Preparation for Planning. Develop strategies for planning, including establishing timeframes, determining the information needed by planners, and the tasks to be accomplished during the planning process.

	No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuous Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
(1) Campus Administrative Staff					
(2) External Consultants					
(3) Faculty					
(4) Governing Board Administrative Staff					
(5) Higher Education Lay Board & Commission Members					
(6) Legislators					
(7) Private Citizens					
(8) Private College Administrators					
(9) State Level Coordinating Staff					

2. Problem Solving. Identification of relevant problems, and the consideration of alternative solutions for those problems.

	No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuous Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
(1) Campus Administrative Staff					
(2) External Consultants					
(3) Faculty					
(4) Governing Board Administrative Staff					
(5) Higher Education Lay Board & Commission Members					
(6) Legislators					
(7) Private Citizens					
(8) Private College Administrators					
(9) State Level Coordinating Staff					

3. Goal Setting. Formulation of immediate and long-range goals and objectives for higher education.

	No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuous Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
(1) Campus Administrative Staff					
(2) External Consultants					
(3) Faculty					
(4) Governing Board Administrative Staff					
(5) Higher Education Lay Board & Commission Members					
(6) Legislators					
(7) Private Citizens					
(8) Private College Administrators					
(9) State Level Coordinating Staff					

4. Prioritizing. Establishing priorities for the distribution of funding, programs, and facilities.

	No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuous Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
(1) Campus Administrative Staff					
(2) External Consultants					
(3) Faculty					
(4) Governing Board Administrative Staff					
(5) Higher Education Lay Board & Commission Members					
(6) Legislators					
(7) Private Citizens					
(8) Private College Administrators					
(9) State Level Coordinating Staff					

5. Editing. Critique of planning drafts with suggestions for improvements.

	No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuous Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
(1) Campus Administrative Staff					
(2) External Consultants					
(3) Faculty					
(4) Governing Board Administrative Staff					
(5) Higher Education Lay Board & Commission Members					
(6) Legislators					
(7) Private Citizens					
(8) Private College Administrators					
(9) State Level Coordinating Staff					

6. Authorization. Approval by authorities who can affect implementation.

	No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuous Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
(1) Campus Administrative Staff					
(2) External Consultants					
(3) Faculty					
(4) Governing Board Administrative Staff					
(5) Higher Education Lay Board & Commission Members					
(6) Legislators					
(7) Private Citizens					
(8) Private College Administrators					
(9) State Level Coordinating Staff					

7. Activating. Implementation of the plan.

	No Participation	Limited Participation (One Time) (Public Forum)	Continuous Advisory Participation	Primary Leadership	Undecided
(1) Campus Administrative Staff					
(2) External Consultants					
(3) Faculty					
(4) Governing Board Administrative Staff					
(5) Higher Education Lay Board & Commission Members					
(6) Legislators					
(7) Private Citizens					
(8) Private College Administrators					
(9) State Level Coordinating Staff					

DUCT OF STATE-LEVEL MASTER PLANNING

The product of state-level master planning is the document (the plan) which is published at the end of the master planning process. The following is a list of components of master planning document. Please indicate the relative importance of each component in the following ways.

1. Circle the number on the scale to the right of each product statement which indicates the importance you believe the product component has in state-level master planning. (1) No Importance (2) Of Little Importance (3) Of Average Importance (4) Very Important (5) Undecided

2. Using the space provided below each statement, rank order the product components from 1-14 with 1 being the most important component and 14 being the least important for the state-level master planning document.

3. Add additional product components of state-level master planning which are not included in the 14 statements.

ter Planning Products	No Importance	Of Little Importance	Of Average Importance	Very Important	Undecided
Educational Goals. Provides standards of excellance for all levels of the higher education system.	1	2	3	4	5
Social Goals. Recognizes the impact of contemporary social problems on higher education, and indicates the adjustments which should be made as a result of such problems.	1	2	3	4	5
Funding Priorities. Estimates the need for economic resources and determines the priorities for funding in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
Supportive Trends. Illustrates the trends regarding student enrollment, program distribution, and funding of higher education institutions, which support planning goals and recommendations.	1	2	3	4	5
Institutional Mission and Role. Illustrates the role and mission of each institution and demonstrates how they differ and how they are similar.	1	2	3	4	5

	No Importance	Of Little Importance	Of Average Importance	Very Important	Undecided
Planning Assumption. Estimates the social, economic, and political conditions of the higher education system for the duration of the plan (five years).	1	2	3	4	5
Explicit Style. Written in a style and language that is easily understood by its intended audience.	1	2	3	4	5
Significant Information. Consists of information which affects decision-making at all levels in the higher education system.	1	2	3	4	5
Complete Information. Includes complete information on subjects about which judgements or decisions are made in adopting the plan.	1	2	3	4	5
Specific Goals and Timetables. Quantifies the goals and tasks to be accomplished with an established timeframe, and assigns responsibilities for implementing the plan.	1	2	3	4	5
Adaptable to Change. Appears changeable if conditions warrant a change. Does not appear as an iron-clad statement of mandates.	1	2	3	4	5
Authentic Endorsement. Shows official initial authority for preparation, and approval of its content by a body that can affect implementation.	1	2	3	4	5
Orderly Structure. Presents information in a logical and organized fashion.	1	2	3	4	5
External and Internal Appearance. Attracts the readers attention as an interesting document to read--not boring.	1	2	3	4	5

itional Product Components: _____

ES OF STATE-LEVEL POSTSECONDARY MASTER PLANNING

he outcomes of state-level master planning are those effects in higher ducation and government which are caused by master planning. The following s a list of outcomes of state-level postsecondary master planning. Please ndicate the relative importance of each outcome in the following ways:

1. Circle the number on the scale to the right of each purpose statement which indicates the importance you believe the outcome has in state-level master planning. (1) No Importance (2) Of Little Importance (3) Of Average Importance (4) Very Important (5) Undecided

2. Using the space provided below each statement, rank order the outcome statements from 1-13 with 1 being the most important and 13 being the least important outcome of state-level master planning.

3. Add additional outcomes of state level master planning which are not included among the 13 statements.

er Planning Outcomes	No Importance	Of Little Importance	Of Average Importance	Very Important	Undecided
Establishes an agenda for action by setting goals and objectives for a state higher education system providing a clear pattern of developmental choices among programs and services.	1	2	3	4	5
Enables higher education administrators to make decisions using economic and enrollment forecasts.	1	2	3	4	5
Raises consciousness about social and economic problems about higher education that may otherwise have been overlooked.	1	2	3	4	5
Unites the public sector of higher education by providing a clear understanding of different roles and creating a spirit of sharing and cooperation.	1	2	3	4	5

	No Importance	Of Little Importan	Of Average Importan	Very Important	Undecided
Intergrates higher education with other sectors of society by studying the effects those other sectors of society have on higher education.	1	2	3	4	5
Improves and enhances communication among top officials on goals and issues in higher education.	1	2	3	4	5
Encourages the public and professionals to view higher education as a system rather than individual isolated institutions.	1	2	3	4	5
Helps to create among legislators and state executive officers a more favorable attitude toward higher education.	1	2	3	4	5
Differentiates the functions for higher education institutions by clearly defining the roles for each institution.	1	2	3	4	5
Encourages innovation and change in higher education institutions.	1	2	3	4	5
Lessens or eliminates unproductive tensions and conflicts among institutions.	1	2	3	4	5
Promotes opportunity for future evaluation of accomplishments by providing performance indicators, for goals and objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
Provides renewal and crystalizes the thinking of higher education officials who are involved in the process of planning or reviewing the plan.	1	2	3	4	5

ditional Outcomes: _____

APPENDIX B

Statewide Higher Education Planning Evaluation

Indicate your opinion regarding the Higher Education Commission's performance in statewide planning by responding "Yes" or "No" to the following questions, and if appropriate whether you think the particular item needs improvement. A comment section is provided at the end and you are encouraged to add comments especially for items which you think should be improved.

	Yes	No	Need Improvement
1. Does the master plan establish an agenda for action by setting goals and objectives for the state system of higher education?	___	___	___
2. Does the master plan contain a clear pattern for pursuing those goals and objectives?	___	___	___
3. Does the master plan identify the major issues that prepare higher education institutions to respond to the social and technological needs of the future?	___	___	___
4. Does the master plan propose strategies for adjusting the enrollment growth and decline?	___	___	___
5. Does the master plan propose strategies for adjusting to economic growth and decline?	___	___	___
6. Does the master plan establish principles of equity for funding higher education institutions?	___	___	___
7. Does the master plan establish principles of equity for program distribution?	___	___	___

8. Does the master plan foster the development of a system of colleges and universities with emphasis on providing high quality higher education? ___ ___ ___

9. Does the master plan encourage the organization of public higher education resources so that they can be used in the most cost efficient manner? ___ ___ ___

10. Does the master plan examine the following tends in higher education:

    a. Social trends? ___ ___ ___
    b. Economic trends? ___ ___ ___
    c. Political trends? ___ ___ ___
    d. Educational trends? ___ ___ ___

11. Does the master plan insure that higher education programs and services are accessible and available to all citizens of the state who desire to participate? ___ ___ ___

12. Does the master plan provide increased accountability of higher education to government officials and the general public? ___ ___ ___

13. Does the master plan contain standards of excellence for all levels (i.e., technical institutes community colleges, universities, graduate and professional schools) of higher education? ___ ___ ___

14. Does the master plan recognize the impact that contemporary social problems have on higher education? ___ ___ ___

15. Does the master plan indicate the adjustments that should be made in higher education as a result of contemporary social problems? ___ ___ ___

16. Does the master plan contain a clear picture of funding priorities for the 5th year duration of the plan? ___ ___ ___

17. Does the master plan contain estimates of the need for economic resources? ___ ___ ___

18. Does the master plan accurately illustrate the trends regarding the following:

    a. Student enrollment? ___ ___ ___
    b. Academic program demand? ___ ___ ___
    c. Funding patterns? ___ ___ ___

19. Do the trends mentioned above generally support the master planning goals and recommendations? ___ ___ ___

20. Does the master plan contain role and mission statements that illustrate how higher education institutions differ and how they are alike? ___ ___ ___

21. Does the master plan contain goals and tasks which are quantified in terms of the following:

    a. What exactly is expected of higher education institutions? ___ ___ ___
    b. Who is expected to accomplish what? ___ ___ ___
    c. Timeframe for when goals should be accomplished? ___ ___ ___

22. Does the master plan appear to be flexible if changes are needed due to changing conditions? ___ ___ ___

23. Does the master plan present information in a logical and organized fashion? ___ ___ ___

24. Does the master plan attract your attention as an interesting document to read-not boring? ___ ___ ___

25. Is the master plan written in a style and language that is easily understood? ___ ___ ___

26. Does the master plan provide a clear pattern of choices in recommending programs and services? ___ ___ ___

27. Has the master plan aided campus administrators in making decisions based on the plans? ___ ___ ___

a. Enrollment forecasts? ___ ___ ___
b. Economic forecasts? ___ ___ ___

28. Has the master plan raised the public consciousness on social and economic problems about higher education that might otherwise have been overlooked? ___ ___ ___

29. Has the master plan united the public sector of higher education by providing a clear understanding of the different roles; creating a spirit of sharing and cooperation? ___ ___ ___

30. Has the master plan encouraged the integration of higher education with other sectors of society? ___ ___ ___

31. Has the master plan caused improvement in communication among top higher education officials concerning goals and issues in higher education? ___ ___ ___

32. Has the master plan caused the public and professionals to view higher education as a system rather than as individual isolated institutions? ___ ___ ___

33. Has the master plan helped to create a more favorable attitude toward higher education among legislators and state executive branch officials? ___ ___ ___

34. Has the master plan encouraged innovation and change in higher education institutions? ___ ___ ___

35. Has the master plan helped to eliminate unproductive conflicts among higher education institutions? ___ ___ ___

36. Has the master plan promoted opportunity for future evaluation of accomplishments by providing performance indicators for goals and objectives? ___ ___ ___

37. Has the master plan provided renewal for higher education officials who were involved in the planning process or in reviewing the plan? ___ ___ ___

38. Does the higher education commission have sufficient authority or influence to see that the plan is implemented? ___ ___ ___

39. Do you think the participation by the following groups in the planning process was adequate:

a. Campus administrative staff? ___ ___ ___
b. External consultants? ___ ___ ___
c. Faculty? ___ ___ ___
d. Governing board administrative staff? ___ ___ ___
e. Higher Education Lay Board and Commission Members? ___ ___ ___
f. Legislators? ___ ___ ___
g. Private citizens? ___ ___ ___
h. Private college administrators? ___ ___ ___
i. State level coordinating staff? ___ ___ ___

Comments

Question No.

___ _____

___ _____

___ _____

___ _____

___ _____

___ _____

___ _____

___ _____

___ _____